DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 444 386 FL 026 379

AUTHOR Seaman, Alan A.
TITLE Evaluating an Innovative Elementary ESL Program.
PUB DATE 2000-03-17
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (Vancouver, BC, Canada, March 14-18, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education Programs; Case Studies; *Classroom Observation Techniques; Comparative Analysis; *Educational Research; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; *English (Second Language); Immigrants; *Program Evaluation; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Teacher Student Relationship

ABSTRACT

This 1999 observational study provided a school district with clear information about the experience of immigrant students in two elementary English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) models, giving administrators, teachers, and school board members a window into the daily classroom life of ESL students. This program evaluation involving observational research design was implemented in a Wheaton, Illinois, school district. An innovative, self-contained elementary ESL program located at two of the district's elementary schools was evaluated through a matched-pairs research design that compared the experience of students in this program with the experience of similar students in the district's ESL pull-out programs. This report describes the observational research methodology and the results. A statistical analysis found significant differences between the level of engagement and teacher student interaction in the two program models, with the results favoring the experimental pod of the ESL program. These results are illustrated with qualitative data, collected through ethnographic narratives, which are presented in the report in the form of case study comparisons. Six appendices are included, containing a glossary of terms, detailed displays of data, sample forms, and other background information regarding the research methodology used. (Contains 10 references.) (KFT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 444 386

TESOL 2000 Convention
Vancouver, B.C.
Friday, March 17, 2000

Evaluating an Innovative Elementary ESL Program

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Alan A. Seaman

PRESENTER:

Alan A. Seaman, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Intercultural Studies/TESL
Wheaton College Graduate School
Alan.Seaman@wheaton.edu

SCHOOL SYSTEM:

Wheaton, Illinois
Community Unit School District 200
ESL Director: Hector Lopez

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL 026 370

Contents of Report

Abstract 3

I. Background 3

II. Support from Prior Research 4

III. Comparison of Pull-Out and Pilot Pod Models Through

Classroom Observational Research 6

A. Methodology 6

B. Limitations 8

IV. Results of the Observational Study 8

V. Specific Factors Noted by the Observers 11

VI. A Case-Study Comparison 12

VII. Concluding Comments 14

References 15

Appendix A Glossary of Terms Used in This Report 16

Appendix B Tables 3A, 3B 17

Appendix C Sytematic Observational Research Process 19

Appendix D Observation Form 1 21

Appendix E Observation Form 2 22

Appendix F Instructions for Observers 23

Abstract

In 1999, an ESL program evaluation involving an observational research design was implemented in Community Unit School District 200, Wheaton, Illinois. An innovative self-contained elementary ESL program located at two of the district's elementary schools was evaluated through a matched pairs research design which compared the experiences of students in this program with the experiences of similar students in the district's ESL pull-out programs. This report describes the observational research methodology, which was conducted by Wheaton College graduate students under supervision of a professor, and the results, which were presented to the school board and administrators in the district. A statistical analysis (through a paired sample t-test) found significant differences between the levels of *engagement* (or time on task) and *teacher-student interaction* in the two program models, with the results favoring the experimental "pod" ESL program model. These results were illustrated by the qualitative data, collected through ethnographic narratives, which were presented in the report in the form of case study comparisons.

I. Background.

This report presents an evaluation focusing on a model English as a second language (ESL) program (described here as the "pilot pod" program) which was implemented at the elementary level in District 200 during the 1998-99 school year and is continuing during 1999-2000. Funding for the pilot ESL program was approved in April 1998 with the expectation that this program will be evaluated on an ongoing basis and, if successful, consideration would be given to expanding the program in future years.

The pilot program involved clustering students at two schools, Washington Elementary (grades K-1) and Madison Elementary (grades 2/3 and 4/5), in addition to the pull-out ESL programs already in existence at seven of the district's elementary schools. The ESL students in the pilot program were tested at English language skill levels of 1, 2, and 3, indicating that they needed a significant degree of support.

To encourage integration with the standard curriculum and interaction with students in the regular classes, each ESL class in the pilot pod program was team-taught by a regular classroom teacher and a trained ESL teacher. In addition, each ESL class was connected with a

"buddy" classroom, which allowed the ESL students to participate in learning activities along with native English speaking children. The student/ teacher ratio was intentionally lowered in the pilot program in order to facilitate student progress.

How successful was the pilot program? There are a number of ways to evaluate a new program, including test scores, portfolios of student work, and parent/student surveys. One particularly salient area to explore is the academic and social experience of students in the classroom. In other words, are ESL students in the pilot program consistently engaged in meaningful learning activities, and is their level of activity significantly higher than one would find in a typical pull-out program where the ESL student is mainstreamed during most of the day?

To examine the academic and social experience of students in the pilot program, a qualitative research study was devised by the members of the ESL task force in collaboration with a professor and graduate students at Wheaton College. Phase One of this study was completed in April 1999, and the results of this phase were reported to the Board in June 1999. Phase Two, which was an expansion of Phase One, was completed in late September and early October 1999. The basic question addressed in both phases of the research is the following: *With the students in the pull-out programs serving as a baseline, are the students receiving the additional services in the pilot programs, to a significant degree, more engaged in the learning process?*

II. Support from Prior Research.

Longitudinal Research by Cummins, Collier, and Thomas. It is important to note that the pilot pod model adopted by District 200 is similar to ESL programs which have been described as effective in several widely-known research studies.

Research by James Cummins (1981, 1984) in Canada in the 1970s and 80s established

two categories for second language acquisition (BICS and CALP) which have different rates of acquisition in educational contexts where students are immersed in a second language. BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) refers to social and functional uses of a foreign language in everyday conversation, in contrast to CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency), which refers to the more complex language used in schooling.

Drawing upon longitudinal data involving standardized academic test scores, Cummins contends that in an immersion context, young children tend to acquire a native-speaker level of proficiency in BICS in 1-2 years, while a grade-level proficiency in CALP may take as long as 4-7 years. He acknowledges that for older children prior educational skills and content can transfer into a new language, accelerating the process of acquiring CALP. For both primary and upper elementary children, however, Cummins' research points to the need for high-quality ESL programs which combine language with academic content in order to increase the rate of acquisition of CALP, the language of schooling.

Virginia Collier and Wayne Thomas (1997, 1999a) extended Cummins' research through a decade-long study of immigrant and refugee students in school districts throughout the U.S. Their research examined the question of which ESL/bilingual program models were most effective in helping ESL students reach grade-level performance in school. Focusing on immigrant children who began their U.S. schooling in kindergarten, Collier and Thomas tracked student progress through standardized test scores and performance assessments to see how long it took for their average levels of academic performance to reach the average of native-English-speaking students at the same grade level. In their research, models which foster collaboration between ESL and grade-level teachers were shown to have a greater positive effect on immigrant student achievement than programs, such as pull-out and self-contained ESL, which deal with language and content in isolation.

In a recently-published summary of this research, Collier and Thomas (1999b) describe an "enrichment" model which emphasizes collaboration between language and grade-level teachers:

> Equal team teaching in an inclusion classroom (a bilingual/ESL certified specialist teaming with a mainstream certified teacher) has the potential to become an enrichment model. In contrast to remediation, enrichment adds to what the students already know. The strengths that English language learners bring to the classroom, including knowledge and life experiences from other cultural contexts, as well as a native speaker's knowledge of another language, are used as resources for learning, as essential building blocks. In enrichment classes, students know that they are being challenged and are deeply engaged in the learning process. (1)

Although the "enrichment" model Collier and Thomas recommend includes instruction in the students' native languages, it bears a strong resemblance to the pilot pod programs adopted by District 200, which includes collaboration between ESL specialists and mainstream teachers in both the self-contained ESL classroom and with the "buddy" classroom.

III. Comparison of Pull-Out and Pilot Pod Models Through Classroom Observational Research.

*A. **Methodology**.* The evaluation study conducted by Wheaton College graduate students examined the educational experiences of students in pilot pod and pull-out programs who were similar in ethnic background, length of time in the school system, and grade level. Students who were typical of a particular grade level in the pilot program were selected, and each student was paired with a student in a pull-out program who was similar in terms of age, educational background, gender, English proficiency level, and length of time in the U.S. In Phase I (April 1999), six pairs of students were selected and observed, for a total of 12 students ranging from first through fifth grade. During Phase II (September-October 1999), twelve pairs of students were selected, for a total of 24 students ranging from kindergarten through fifth grade. Informed consent was obtained from the families of all of the participants in the study.

The 36 ESL students selected for this study represented a broad range of ethnic backgrounds. Fifteen nationalities and twelve languages were represented in the sample:

Table 1
Countries of Origin

Mexico	10	India	1
Vietnam	6	Cambodia	1
Bosnia	5	Chile	1
Russia	2	Iran	1
Venezuela	2	Croatia	1
Korea	2	Czech Rep.	1
China	1	Norway	1
Colombia	1		

The systematic observation of these students totaled more than 162 hours, or approximately 4.5 hours per student in their classroom contexts.

The observers were education majors and prospective ESL teachers enrolled in graduate courses at Wheaton College. None of the observers had taught in District 200 before, nor had any attended District 200 schools. The researchers were given training and strict protocols for using the observation forms. Each observed a student in the pilot ESL program for three 90-minute sessions during a one-week period, followed by an identical observation schedule with the paired student in the pull-out program during the following week. The same observational methodology was used in both phases of the study.

The observations included (1) a *practice session* in the classroom, which was not included in the final data analysis, (2) a *90-minute ethnographic narrative* of each student's experience in the classroom, (3) *two 90-minute records of* each student's *"time on task," teacher-student interactions, and student-student interactions.* (For a definition of each of these terms, see the addendum to this report.) The data were recorded on forms which were submitted to Dr. Alan Seaman at the graduate school for analysis. In addition, each researcher wrote a 10-

page analysis of the students that he or she had observed. Formal data analysis included tabulations of the data and comparisons of group means using statistical analysis, with the level of significance set at $p<.05$.

This research design combined two types of data collection: classroom ethnography and observational research. By gathering data systematically through two different approaches, we hoped to support any findings through a process of triangulation. This approach follows the educational research procedures described in widely-used texts (Borg & Gall 1989; Nunan 1992; Alderson & Beretta 1992). The dual focus on interaction and time on task (also referred to as "work involvement" or "engagement") reflects two lines of classroom research which are particularly relevant to the experience of ESL students (Chaudron 1988; Whitrock 1986, pp. 400-402).

B. Limitations. As is common in qualitative research, this study used purposive sampling rather than a random sampling design. However, the sample size (18 pairs, 36 students) is large enough to suggest patterns which exist within and between the two programs. Although the pairs of students were matched as closely as possible, it was difficult to achieve perfect matches, and factors such as personality differences between the two students in each pair (e.g., introversion/ extroversion) could not be controlled.

IV. Results of the Observational Study.

The quantitative and qualitative evidence from the two phases of this study indicates that *the experience of the students in the pilot ESL programs is different from that of the students in the pull-out ESL programs.* An extensive summary of the data from both phases of the study is presented in Table 4 at the end of this report.

In 16 of the 18 pairs studied, the student in the pilot program had a *higher level of on-task activity (engagement)* than the similar student in a pull-out program (See Tables 3A and B in

Appendix B). Overall, students in the pilot pod programs were engaged in on-task behavior 94 percent of the time that they were in class, while students who were mainstreamed in the pull-out programs were on-task an average of 85 percent of the time.

Was this difference significant? Using a paired sample t-test for statistical analysis, the results for *percentage of time on-task* did indeed prove to favor the pilot program at a strong .002 level of significance (See Table 2 below). The differences between the two programs in terms of the percentage of the time that the students were engaged in learning were unlikely to have happened by chance. This means that the students in the pilot pod program were consistently focused on learning during a significantly higher percentage of the classtime observed.

These results point to the generalization that the students in the pilot program were, in each pair and overall, more active learners in the classroom than were their peers in the pull-out programs. They were more engaged and focused upon the activities set by the teacher. As a result, it is likely that the students in the pilot program were having a significantly different educational experience than they would have had if they were mainstreamed during most of the school day.

It should be noted that *this study reflected very positively on the work of the pull-out ESL teachers in each school.* During their 30 minutes with the students each day, these teachers were observed providing an active, low-stress environment for learning similar to the environment in the pilot pod program. The differences between the two groups were primarily related to the ESL students' experiences in regular classrooms while they were being mainstreamed.

Although the overall frequency and rate of interaction (between teacher and student and student and peers) was higher for the students in the pilot pod program than for the students in the pull-out ESL programs, these differences between the two program models were not found to be significant. However, when the
data collected during the 30-minute pull-out ESL class is separated from the mainstream class data, a very significant difference emerges.

The results in Table 2 show that mainstream teachers were interacting with the ESL students at a much lower rate (.18 interactions per minute) than the rate of teacher-student

interaction in the pilot pod program (.36 interactions per minute). Although the students' time in pull-out ESL classes constituted only about 16 % of the total observation time, the pull-out teachers' interactions with the students accounted for over 53 % of the total. In other words, a number of the students in the pull-out model were receiving very limited amounts of teacher-student interaction while they were mainstreamed during most of the day, with an intensive amount of interaction while they were in the 30-minute pull-out ESL classes.

It is important to note that *in approximately half of the pairs (nine out of the eighteen), the differences between the two programs were minimal,* at least in terms of the constructs of engagement and interaction. In the other half, the differences were more dramatic. As we noted in the previous report, this suggests that some mainstream teachers are effective in engaging ESL students in their class activities -- even students who are at the lower levels of English proficiency.

Table 2: Significant Differences (Paired Sample T-Test):

Variable	Mean for Pilot Pod	Mean for Mainstream and Pull-Out	Difference in Means	Standard Deviation	t value	Significance Level p <
On-Task Percentage	.9422	.8556	.0866	.1004	3.66	.002
	Mean for Pilot Pod	**Mean for Mainstream (Without Pull-Out)**	**Difference in Means**	**Standard Deviation**	**t value**	**Significance Level**
On-Task Percentage	.9422	.8450	.0972	.1115	3.69	.002
Teacher-Student Interaction Rate (interactions/minute)	.3567	.1814	.1753	.1906	3.90	.001

This diversity of teaching approaches may, in part, account for the much broader *ranges of engagement and interaction* for the students in the pull-out programs than for the students in the pilot pod programs. In the pilot pod programs, the percentage of time on task ranged from

1.00 to .84, with nearly all of the students above the .90 level, while for the students in the pull-out programs the percentage extended from .97 to .59, with only half of the students at .90 or above.

V. Specific Factors Noted by the Observers.

What accounts for the success of the pilot pod program in encouraging a high level of engagement in learning activities? Comments by the researchers in their individual reports shed some light on this question.

- All of the researchers noted the *lower student/teacher ratio* in the pilot pod classrooms. The ESL students who were mainstreamed in the pull-out programs had a low student/teacher ratio while they were in the ESL pull-out classrooms for 30 minutes each day, but during the rest of their school day, they were in classrooms with a ratio of 25:1 or more. As expected, the students in the pilot pod programs were receiving more individual attention from their teachers.

- Another consistent theme in the researchers' comments was that the ESL students in the pilot programs seemed *less isolated* than their peers in the pull-out programs. Mainstreamed in large classrooms with few peers from similar ethnic backgrounds, the ESL students in the pull-out programs simply had fewer opportunities to communicate with others and participate in the curriculum. In several cases, the regular teacher expressed frustration that he or she was unable to give ESL students much attention.

- Finally, the researchers consistently noted that the experience of the students in the pilot pod programs was *less fragmented* than that of their peers in the pull-out programs. The mainstream classes were disrupted as students were pulled out for special purposes, and

the ESL students were expected to catch up on what the class had been covering during the pull-out period. The discontinuity of the students' experiences in these classes seemed different from the clearly-structured, low-stress environment of the pilot pod classes.

As one researcher noted, summing up the contrasts seen by most of the observers in this study:

> the ESL students [in the pilot pod program] seemed to be able to go more in depth with their activities because they were all together, working at a similar pace, and had longer time periods to devote to certain activities. The feeling [in the pull-out program] was that the students had disruptive, choppy days where they were involved in two classrooms with different field-trips, activities, and teachers. The pod teacher stated that her classroom works at a slower pace so that her students can learn important social and linguistic rules. She focuses on more basic, hands-on types of activities as well. From my observations, however, I would argue that the pilot pod classroom was in no way slower than either the mainstream classroom or the ESL classroom [at the other school].

VI. A Case-Study Comparison

To sum up, a brief comparison may be useful in highlighting differences in the experiences of students in the two programs:

Alexander[1] is a second grader who emigrated to the U.S. in the spring of 1998. He is described as a pleasant but shy boy who tends to be quiet in his classes in the pod program at Madison Elementary. Alexander still primarily speaks Russian at home and has been making

[1]Pseudonyms are used in this section to protect the identity of individual students.

continuous but slow progress with acquiring oral proficiency in English. In the pilot pod program, he appears relaxed and focused as he works with other children in groups.

The researcher describes Alexander's context as follows: "The students almost always work in groups with one of the instructors. The atmosphere in class is relaxed and it's obvious that students are familiar with the structure and routine of moving from group to group." Every minute of class is used efficiently. During the course of an observation, Alexander meets with a reading group with six other students at his level of English proficiency. They work with a teacher's aide on a book entitled *My Garden*, and Alexander seems to feel a sense of achievement when he reads a section the book aloud to the others. The vocabulary of the book is reinforced with vocabulary cards. Later, Alexander meets with a third-grade "buddy" reader who reads him a different book. He moves on to the computer lab, where he enters his name and begins to type out a writing exercise on the keyboard.

Like Alexander, Lars is a second-grader who is at a beginning level of English proficiency and has come from Northern Europe. He speaks a Scandinavian language with his family at home. In the elementary school where he is in a pull-out program, Lars is quiet and attentive. He has difficulty speaking with his more fluent peers, even when in the pull-out ESL class. The content of his pull-out ESL class is coordinated with the second grade class in which he is mainstreamed -- a unit on the theme of "community." After an hour of instruction in the ESL pull-out class, Lars enters his grade-level class partway through a hands-on science activity related to donut production. The teacher directs Lars and two other ESL students to work on a computer in the back of the room while the other children complete the activity in groups.

When he is able to participate with his classmates on an art project, his quietness evaporates for a moment to reveal a clever, mischievous personality. But faced with a literacy-related worksheet, Lars struggles to understand the instructions, staring at the paper, then looking around. After several minutes, the teacher circulates to his desk and reiterates the instructions in a form he can understand.

The above description highlights some of the differences between the two program

models that were repeatedly observed. Both students had similar language and socio-economic backgrounds, and they were at a similar level of English proficiency. In the pilot pod program, the content was carefully sequenced and modified in order to be comprehensible to the ESL students. On the other hand, Lars' mainstream teacher (who was by all accounts, a skilled, caring teacher) was accustomed to assuming that the students could handle activities and exercises which involved context-reduced uses of language.

Like many ESL students in these classes, Lars was seen either waiting patiently for an explanation of the instructions, and at times, he was isolated from group activities covered in class. His lower percentage of "time on task" during the lessons means that over the course of a year, he may have significantly less actual learning time than Alexander. By maximizing the amount of time ESL students spend on academic tasks, and using comprehensible language tailored to their levels of proficiency, the teachers in the pilot pod program are positioned to help these children close the gap between themselves and their peers as efficiently as possible.

VII. Concluding Comments.

This observational study provided the school district with clear information about the experience of immigrant students in the two elementary ESL models. This information gave administrators, teachers, school board members a window into the daily classroom life of ESL students. It will help the district make an informed decision about what models may be educationally valuable in the future.

Other school districts may consider using a similar process when making decisions about the future. In addition to test scores, surveys, and other sources of information, observational data, if gathered and analyzed systematically, can be a helpful part of the evaluation process.

References

Alderson, C. & Beretta, A. (1992). *Evaluating second language education*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Borg, W. & Gall, M. (1989). *Educational research: An introduction*, 5th ed. New York: Longman.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Collier, V. & Thomas, W. (1999a) Making U.S. schools effective for English language learners, Part 1. *TESOL Matters*, 9:4, 1, 6.

Collier, V. & Thomas, W. (1999b) Making U.S. schools effective for English language learners, Part 2. *TESOL Matters*, 9:5, 1, 6.

Cummins, J. (1981) Age on arrival and immigrant second language learning in Canada: A reassessment. *Applied Linguistics*, 2, 132-149.

Cummins, J. (1984) *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Thomas, W. & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students*. Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Wittrock, M., Ed. (1986). *Handbook of research on teaching*, 3rd Ed. New York: Macmillan.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the following people who contributed directly to this evaluation study: Dr. Bev Becker, Assistant Superintendent for Special Services; Hector Lopez, Chair of ESL and Bilingual Education; and Wheaton College graduate student researchers Candis Bounds, Danielle Braaten, Vicki Cairns, Carolyn Christensen, Rosalie Der, Jerry Elvey, Dee Ann Flora, Sonja Gassett, Heather Hasty, Grace Ho, Maggie Hoover, Esther Joung, Kathleen Kepley, Astrid Li, Laura Parkerson, Kathleen Poach, Jeong-Sil Suh, and Tanya Thomas.

Appendix A
Glossary of Terms Used in This Report

Activity - An activity is defined as any block of time in the lesson plan. It can include lecturing by the teacher, pair work, worksheets, silent reading, science experiments, and so forth.

Time on Task - Time on task (also known as "engagement" or "work involvement") is defined as any period of time in which the student is focused on the activity introduced by the teacher. If the student is focused on something else (even if it is productive, such as reading), he/she is "off task.." In this study, time on task was recorded in terms of duration.

Interaction - Interaction is defined as any time the student speaks to a teacher or aide, or to another student. This is recorded in terms of frequency of utterances rather than utterance length. If the teacher asks the student three questions in a row, and the student answers each question, then three interactions are recorded. If the ESL student is involved in a conversation with another student, one interaction is recorded for every time the ESL student speaks (i.e., for each "turn" in the conversation).

Significance - Statistical significance is a computation of the probability that observed differences are the result of chance alone. A significant difference (between two means, for instance) at the .05 level implies that there is a 95% probability that the results are not the result of chance. (This probability level was set prior to the data gathering phase of the study.) It is important to note that in this qualitative study, which did not involve random sampling, the results are *significant only for the group of students studied.* The results are only *suggestive* of differences in the larger populations of the two types of ESL programs.

Appendix B

Table 3A - Comparison of Student Experience in Pilot Pod and Pull-Out ESL Programs

A. Pilot Pod Programs

Case[2]	*School/Grade*	*Ethnic*	*On Task* (% of total time)	*Teacher-Student Interaction* (frequency and interactions per minute)	*Student-Student Interaction* (frequency and interactions per minute)
			PHASE ONE (April 1999)		
1A	Washington/1	Bosnian	.98	101 (.55)	257 (1.40)
2A	Washington/1	Venezuelan	.96	76 (.46)	62 (.38)
3A	Madison/2	Mexican	.95	79 (.43)	194 (1.07)
4A	Madison/2	Bosnian	.91	88 (.49)	66 (.37)
5A	Madison/3	Venezuelan	.87	77 (.43)	70 (.39)
6A	Madison/5	Mexican	1.00	34 (.19)	76 (.42)
			PHASE TWO (September-October 1999)		
7A	Washington/K	Cambodian	.98	60 (.33)	50 (.27)
8A	Washington/K	Mexican	.93	111 (.61)	80 (.44)
9A	Washington/1	Colombian	.93	44 (.24)	8 (.04)
10A	Washington/1	Mexican	.96	59 (.32)	93 (.51)
11A	Madison/2	Chilean	.93	72 (.40)	43 (.24)
12A	Madison/2	Russian	.96	47 (.26)	36 (.20)
13A	Madison/3	Iranian	.84	25 (.14)	39 (.22)
14A	Madison/3	Vietnamese	.97	84 (.47)	92 (.51)
15A	Madison/4	Vietnamese	.96	30 (.17)	25 (.14)
16A	Madison/4	Russian	.96	76 (.42)	69 (.38)
17A	Madison/5	Korean	.92	52 (.29)	36 (.20)
18A	Madison/5	Croatian	.95	40 (.22)	53 (.29)
Totals (means):			**.94**	**64 (.36)**	**75 (.41)**

[2] The case numbers reflect pairs of students: 1A and 1B were paired, 2A and 2B, and so on.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3B
B. Pull-Out Programs

Case	*School/Grade*	*Ethnic*	*On Task*	*Teacher-Student Interaction*	*Student-Student Interaction*
			(% of total time)	*(frequency and interactions per minute)*	
			PHASE ONE (April 1999)		
1B	Hawthorne/1	Vietnamese	.77	70 (.38)	68 (.37)
2B	Hawthorne/1	Mexican	.89	2 (.01)	37 (.26)
3B	Longfellow/2	Mexican	.91	112 (.62)	16 (.09)
4B	Hawthorne/2	Bosnian	.90	47 (.26)	45 (.25)
5B	Lincoln/2	Chinese	.58	1 (.01)	6 (.03)
6B	Johnson/4	Mexican	.90	56 (.31)	47 (.26)
			PHASE TWO (Sept.-Oct. 1999)		
7B	Johnson/K	Korean	.96	46 (.25)	134 (.74)
8B	Longfellow/K	Mexican	.87	74 (.41)	19 (.10)
9B	Longfellow/1	Mexican	.63	2 (.01)	6 (.03)
10B	Lincoln/1	Mexican	.95	36 (.20)	97 (.54)
11B	Longfellow/2	Vietnamese	.96	62 (.34)	29 (.16)
12B	Lowell/2	Norwegian	.77	69 (.38)	57 (.32)
13B	Longfellow/3	Czech	.79	29 (.16)	5 (.03)
14B	Lincoln/2	Vietnamese	.82	54 (.30)	64 (.36)
15B	Lincoln/4	Vietnamese	.92	93 (.52)	106 (.59)
16B	Lincoln/4	Bosnian	.95	229 (1.27)	115 (.64)
17B	Lowell/5	Indian	.86	5 (.03)	18 (.10)
18B	Longfellow/5	Bosnian	.97	56 (.31)	32 (.18)
Totals (means):			**.86**	**58 (.32)**	**50 (.28)**
Without ESL Pull-Out			*.84*	*27 (.18)*	*44 (.30)*

Appendix C

Systematic Observational Research Process

I. Goal. As objectively as possible, to make comparisons between pull-out ESL students and pod-program students in terms of their experience in the academic setting. Using the pull-out programs as a baseline, is there a significant difference in the experience of these students to justify the additional cost?

II. Procedures.

A. Sample. Match pairs of students according to age, grade level, cultural background language background, gender, length of time in program and LAS scores.

B. Develop Observation Forms. These will record classroom behaviors in terms of (1) an overall ethnographic narrative, (2) engagement or time on task, (3) teacher-student interaction, (4) interaction with peers.

C. Select and Train Observers. Observers will have at least one hour of training in how to use the forms and one hour of practice in a classroom setting, with feedback, before they begin to collect the data.

D. Obtain Consent. The purpose of the research will be communicated to principals, teachers, students, and parents. Informed consent will be obtained before any observations are done. Anonymity of students and teachers will be assured.

E. Data Collection. Observers will shadow the ESL students during similar parts of the school day. During the first week, the student in the experimental program will be observed; during the second week the paired student in the pull-out program will be observed. After a practice observation using the forms, the observers will complete three 90-minute observations. The first will record an ethnographic narrative. The second and third will collect time-on-task and interaction data.

F. Data Analysis. The frequency counts for each behavior will be tabulated, and a paired samples t test ($p < .05$ level of significance) will be used to compare the data in the two groups.

G. Reporting the Study. The report will include the statistical data and a summary of the insights from the data. Typical students will be selected to be profiled in two case studies.

Appendix D

ESL Pilot Pod Evaluation Study
Community Unit District 200 Public Schools

OBSERVATION FORM 1
ETHNOGRAPHIC NARRATIVE

Teacher: (sample form) **Date:** _____

Location: _____ **Times:** _____

Observer: _____

Instructions: Using complete sentences, write a narrative of the ESL students' involvement in class over a one- to two-hour period. Include a diagram of the classroom which shows where the students are seated. Describe clearly the students' involvement in tasks and activities.

10:00 Ahmed is working with a partner on a craft project involving shells. They are constructing a small "beach" on a piece of cardboard. Ahmed's partner is another ESL student. They work quietly on separate parts of the board, then talk about what they will do next. A: "I'm going to make a hill of sand."

10:10 The teacher compliments A. on his project and asks the class to stop what they are doing and clean up. A. moves his cardboard project to the side of the room and washes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix E

ESL Pilot Pod Evaluation Study
Community Unit District 200 Public Schools

OBSERVATION FORM 2
DESCRIPTIVE OBSERVATION RECORD

Teacher` (Sample form) Date: _____

Location: _____ Times: _____

Observer: _____

In the left column, record the activities that the student is engaged in over a two-hour period. In the central column, record the length of time that the student is "on task," engaged in the activity. Record the specific times in terms of minutes and seconds. In the right columns, record the frequency of interaction between (1) the student and a teacher or aide and between (2) the student and other students.

ACTIVITY *Starting/Finishing Times*	ON-TASK BEHAVIOR *Starting/Finishing Times*	INTERACTION *Teacher-Student*	INTERACTION *Student-Student*
1:00 Group calendar activity 1:17	1:00 - 1:06 1:08 - 1:12 1:15 - 1:17	II	~~HH~~ I
1:17 Calendar worksheet 1:28	1:17 - 1:26	I	
1:28 Physical Education - outside 1:45	1:28 - 1:40 1:44 - 1:45 Note: A. sits by self for 4 minutes.	~~HH~~ II	III
1:45 Language Arts: Reading 2:10	1:45 - 2:02 2:08 - 2:10	II	III

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix F

ESL Pilot Pod Evaluation Study
Community Unit District 200 Public Schools

INSTRUCTIONS FOR OBSERVERS

1. In addition to these instructions, this packet contains (1) an assignment sheet and schedule for the first week of observations, (2) copies of the two observation forms which have been filled out as a model to follow, and (3) blank observation forms for the first week.

2. Observation Schedule:

- **During the first week**, you will have a **45-minute practice session** in the classroom. During this time you should spend 15 minutes recording an ethnographic narrative (Form 1) and 30 minutes recording the time on task/interaction data (Form 2).

- During the remaining **three observation sessions** you will do three 90-minute observations of the assigned student in the pilot/pod program. During the first 90-minute observation you will complete an ethnographic narrative (Form 1). During the second and third 90-minute observations, you will collect the descriptive data for Form 2.

- **During the second week**, you will follow the same schedule for a student in a pull-out program. You should complete the forms in the same sequence and observe at roughly the same times.

3. The Observation Forms:

- **Ethnographic Narrative (Form 1).** As you observe the student, write a narrative account of what he/she is doing during each phase of the observation. Identify the classroom activity and describe what the student does. It is important that this narrative be in prose (in complete sentences) rather than in the form of sketchy notes. You and others will be reading it later.

- **Descriptive Observation Record (Form 2).** As you observe the student, have a watch and the observation forms in front of you. With each classroom activity, record the beginning and ending times, the nature of the activity, the beginning and ending times of on-task behavior by the student, and a tally of the student's interaction with the teacher (or an aide) and with other students.

  a. An "Activity" is defined as any block of time in the lesson plan. It can include lecturing by the teacher, pair work, worksheets, silent reading, science experiments, and so forth. Look at the activity as a complete unit: do not break it into too many smaller parts (such as "instructions").

b. "Time on Task" is defined as any period of time in which the student is focused on the activity. If the student is focused on something else (even if it is productive, such as reading), he/she is "off task." If the student finishes an activity early and does something else, or if he/she is in a small group but is not listening or speaking to the others, the student is "off task." Obviously, you will need to make some judgment calls as an observer. The key is to be consistent in what you define as "on task" behavior.

c. "Interaction" is defined as any time the student speaks to a teacher or aide, or to another student. Record this in terms of utterances. If the teacher asks the student three questions in a row, and the student answers each question, then you would record three interactions. If the student speaks in front of the class for five minutes this would be recorded as one interaction. (You are recording frequency, not length.) If the student is involved in a conversation with another student, record one interaction for every time he/she speaks (i.e., one for each "turn" in the conversation).

4. Procedures.

- Please introduce yourself to the teacher when you arrive in the classroom, and ask her where you should sit. Be unobtrusive in your seating, but position yourself so you have a good view of the student you are observing. If the student is repositioned in the classroom or goes to another room, you should follow the student in order to be within earshot. Do not sit or stand close to the student, however; try to keep at least 10-15 feet of distance between yourself and the student.

- If possible, don't talk with the student. (You could have a brief conversation, of course, but don't make him/her overly aware of your presence.) Do not participate in classroom activities as an aide. If someone asks you to help a student, politely explain that you are involved in collecting research data.

- When you enter the school, you may need to enter the main office to sign in. Follow the appropriate procedures for visitors to the building.

- When you have completed all of the observations, make photocopies of the forms (or give them to Alan Seaman to photocopy) so you can keep one copy to use in your own analysis.

5. If you have any questions about this, please feel free to call Alan Seaman at home or at work.